



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

104

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/993,621	11/27/2001	Koichiro Nagar	Q66977	8241
23373	7590	07/12/2004	EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037			PUTTLITZ, KARL J	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1621		

DATE MAILED: 07/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b><i>Interview Summary</i></b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/993,621	NAGAR ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> Karl J. Puttlitz	<b>Art Unit</b> 1621

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Karl J. Puttlitz. (3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Joseph Ruch. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 08 July 2004.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 5-16.

Identification of prior art discussed: US '495 (Hirata) and EP109.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative proposed differences between the production method of claims 5-16 and the production method disclosed by the applied references. Applicant's representative also pointed out differences between the claimed production method and the prior art processes based on the examples and comparative examples in the application. Applicant's representative also discussed possible amendments..

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
Examiner's signature, if required